

any strategy for holding Putin accountable for his savage attacks on innocent civilians.

Again, I thank all of my colleagues for their good work and look forward to passing PNTR in the Senate tomorrow morning.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 10 a.m. tomorrow, April 7, the Senate resume legislative session and proceed to the en bloc consideration of H.R. 6968, the Russian oil ban, and H.R. 7108, the Russia PNTR, both of which are at the desk; that amendment No. 5021 to H.R. 6968 be considered and agreed to; that amendment No. 5020 to H.R. 7108 be considered and agreed to; and that those be the only amendments in order to either bill; that the bills, as amended, be considered read a third time en bloc; that the Senate vote on the passage of H.R. 7108, as amended, and H.R. 6968, as amended; and that with respect to both bills, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table without further intervening action or debate; further, that upon the disposition of H.R. 6968, the Senate resume executive session and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 860, the nomination of Ketanji Brown Jackson. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion with respect to the Jackson nomination be waived; that if any nominations are confirmed during Thursday's session of the Senate, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise in strong support for Senator SCHUMER's request for unanimous consent for the Senate to proceed to the en bloc consideration of H.R. 6968, the Russian oil ban, and H.R. 7108, the Russian permanent normal trade relations legislation.

I want to thank Senators SCHUMER, WYDEN, WICKER, PAUL, CARDIN, MURKOWSKI, MANCHIN, LANKFORD, RISCH, MENENDEZ, CORNYN, and SULLIVAN. It is a long list of Senators who worked hard on this legislation to get us to this point. They exemplify how you can be both principled and reasonable.

I want to especially again thank Senator SCHUMER. We did work carefully and long together. We spent tireless days working to try to make sure that this worked out. We, I think, both acknowledge that we respect the good faith that each of us has shown in moving this forward and getting it to this point.

Thanks to the efforts of all of these Senators, the Senate is in a position to pass these important bills. Importantly,

their efforts in this Chamber reflect the best of what Ukraine desperately seeks to preserve and that which Vladimir Putin is determined to destroy: freedom and representative government.

That is why the legislation at issue is so important. It strikes directly at Putin and cuts off the lifeblood for his war machine and his autocracy by banning U.S. imports of Russian energy products, including petroleum, natural gas, and coal. It places Russia and Belarus in the same pariah status as North Korea and Cuba for trade.

The congressional action, including the certification criteria in the bills, is critical because it signifies a standing commitment to the Ukrainian people and to our NATO allies that is more durable than Putin's machinations in Ukraine. This legislation will inspire our allies to take similar actions against Russia.

As President Zelenskyy told us when he asked for the ban, "[It] can be called an embargo [or it can be] just morality."

Because this legislation is so critical to the support of Ukraine, we must act in unison on these bills and call on Speaker PELOSI to promptly vote on this legislation in the House, where it will also receive a resounding vote in favor.

Therefore, I strongly second Senator SCHUMER's request and also ask that the Senate agree to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my friend, the Senator from Idaho.

#### UKRAINE DEMOCRACY DEFENSE LEND-LEASE ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as we move on, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. 3522 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3522) to provide enhanced authority for the President to enter into agreements with the Government of Ukraine to lend or lease defense articles to that Government to protect civilian populations in Ukraine from Russian military invasion, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the Cornyn substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 5022) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ukraine Democracy Defense Lend-Lease Act of 2022".

#### SEC. 2. LOAN AND LEASE OF DEFENSE ARTICLES TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF UKRAINE AND EASTERN FLANK COUNTRIES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO LEND OR LEASE DEFENSE ARTICLES TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), for fiscal years 2022 and 2023, the President may authorize the United States Government to lend or lease defense articles to the Government of Ukraine or to governments of Eastern European countries impacted by the Russian Federation's invasion of Ukraine to help bolster those countries' defense capabilities and protect their civilian populations from potential invasion or ongoing aggression by the armed forces of the Government of the Russian Federation.

(2) EXCLUSIONS.—For the purposes of the authority described in paragraph (1) as that authority relates to Ukraine, the following provisions of law shall not apply:

(A) Section 503(b)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2311(b)(3)).

(B) Section 61 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2796).

(3) CONDITION.—Any loan or lease of defense articles to the Government of Ukraine under paragraph (1) shall be subject to all applicable laws concerning the return of and reimbursement and repayment for defense articles loan or leased to foreign governments.

(4) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The President may delegate the enhanced authority under this subsection only to an official appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) PROCEDURES FOR DELIVERY OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall establish expedited procedures for the delivery of any defense article loaned or leased to the Government of Ukraine under an agreement entered into under subsection (a) to ensure timely delivery of the article to that Government.

(c) DEFINITION OF DEFENSE ARTICLE.—In this Act, the term "defense article" has the meaning given that term in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate and the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 3522), as amended, was passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 4008

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4008) to provide COVID relief for restaurants, gyms, minor league sports teams, border businesses, live venue service providers, exclave businesses, and providers of transportation services.

Mr. SCHUMER. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 4022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4022) to codify in statute the CDC title 42 expulsion order, which suspends the right for certain aliens to enter the United States land borders, until February 1, 2025.

Mr. SCHUMER. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

#### BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE EXPANSION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 295, S. 270.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 270) to amend the Act entitled “Act to provide for the establishment of the Brown v. Board of Education National Historic Site in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes” to provide for inclusion of additional related sites in the National Park System, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment, as follows:

(The part of the bill intended to be inserted is printed in italic.)

S. 270

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Brown v. Board of Education National Historic Site Expansion Act”.

#### SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF THE BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

In order to honor the civil rights stories of struggle, perseverance, and activism in the pursuit of education equity, the Act entitled “Act to provide for the establishment of the

Brown v. Board of Education National Historic Site in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes” approved October 26, 1992 (Public Law 102-525; 106 Stat. 3438 et seq.), is amended as follows:

(1) In section 101, by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) The terms ‘affiliated area’ and ‘affiliated areas’ mean one or more of the locations associated with the four court cases included in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka described in section 102(a)(8), (9), and (10).”.

(2) In section 102(a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively;

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2), the following:

“(3) The Brown case was joined by four other cases related to school segregation pending before the Supreme Court (Briggs v. Elliott, filed in South Carolina; Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, Spottswood Thomas Bolling, et al., Petitioners, v. C. Melvin Sharpe, President of the District of Columbia Board of Education, et al., filed in Virginia; Gebhart v. Belton, filed in Delaware; and Bolling v. Sharpe, filed in the District of Columbia) and consolidated into one case named Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka.

“(4) A 1999 historic resources study examined the five cases included in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka and found each to be nationally significant and to contribute unique stories to the case for educational equity.”; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (6) (as so redesignated by this section), the following:

“(7) Summerton High School in South Carolina, the all-White school that refused to admit the plaintiffs in Briggs v. Elliott, has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places in recognition of its national significance and is used as administrative offices for Clarendon School District 1. Other sites include former Scott’s Branch High School, an ‘equalization school’ constructed for African-American students in 1951 to provide facilities comparable to those of White students and that is now the Community Resource Center owned by Clarendon School District 1.

“(8) Robert Russa Moton School, the all-Black school in Farmville, Virginia, which was the location of a student-led strike leading to Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, Spottswood Thomas Bolling, et al., Petitioners, v. C. Melvin Sharpe, President of the District of Columbia Board of Education, et al., has been designated a National Historic Landmark in recognition of its national significance. The school, now the Robert Russa Moton Museum, is governed by the Moton Museum, Inc., and affiliated with Longwood University.

“(9) Howard High School in Wilmington, Delaware, an all-Black school to which plaintiffs in Belton v. Gebhart were forced to travel, has been designated a National Historic Landmark in recognition of its national significance. Now the Howard High School of Technology, it is an active school administered by the New Castle County Vocational-Technical School District. The all-White Claymont High School, which denied plaintiffs admission, is now the Claymont Community Center administered by the Brandywine Community Resource Council, Inc. The Hockessin School #107C (Hockessin Colored School) is the all-Black school in Hockessin, Delaware that one of the plaintiffs in Belton v. Gebhart was required to attend with no public transportation provided. The former Hockessin School building is utilized by Friends of Hockessin Colored School #107, Inc. as a community facility.

“(10) John Philip Sousa Junior High School in the District of Columbia, the all-White school that refused to admit plaintiffs in Bolling v. Sharpe, has been designated a National Historic Landmark in recognition of its national significance. John Philip Sousa Junior High School, now John Philip Sousa Middle School, is owned by the District of Columbia Department of General Services and administered by the District of Columbia Public Schools.”.

(3) In section 102(b)(3)—

(A) by inserting “, protection,” after “preservation”;

(B) by inserting “, Kansas; Summerton, South Carolina; Farmville, Virginia; Wilmington and Hockessin, Delaware; and the District of Columbia” after “Topeka”; and

(C) by inserting “and the context of Brown v. Board of Education” after “civil rights movement”.

(4) In section 103, by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to land described in subsection (b), the historic site shall consist of land and interests in land identified as Summerton High School and Scott’s Branch High School located in Clarendon County, South Carolina, after such land, or interests in land, is acquired by the Secretary and the determination is made under paragraph (2).

“(2) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—The historic site shall not be expanded until the date on which the Secretary determines that a sufficient quantity of land, or interests in land, has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit.

“(3) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a determination under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the expansion of the historic site.

“(4) MAP.—After the determination in subsection (2), the Secretary shall publish a new map of the historic site to include land or interests in land acquired under this subsection.”.

(5) In section 104—

(A) by striking “section 103(b)” and inserting “subsections (b) and (c) of section 103”;

(B) by striking “: *Provided, however,* That the” and inserting “: The”; and

(C) by adding before the final period the following: “nor by condemnation of any land or interest in land within the boundaries of the historic site”.

(6) In section 105(c), by inserting before the final period the following: “in Topeka, Kansas. After the boundary adjustment under section 103(c), the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a general management plan for the historic site locations in Clarendon County, South Carolina”.

(7) By inserting after section 105, the following:

#### “SEC. 106. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION AFFILIATED AREAS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The locations associated with the three court cases included in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka described in sections 102(a)(8), (9), and (10) are established as affiliated areas of the National Park System.

“(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The affiliated areas shall be managed in accordance with—

“(1) this section; and

“(2) any law generally applicable to units of the National Park System.

“(c) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act,